

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Janine Zajac	Team: Team # 1	CCRB Case #: 201109122	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 07/10/2011 5:27 AM	Location of Incident: White Castle restaurant located at 900 Pennsylvania Avenue.	Precinct: 75	18 Mo. SOL 1/10/2013	EO SOL 1/10/2013	
Date/Time CV Reported Sun, 07/10/2011 5:27 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 07/14/2011 2:23 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. CPT Scott Henderson	00000	915880	PBBN

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.CPT Scott Henderson	Off. Language: Capt. Scott Henderson made remarks to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) based upon gender.	
B.CPT Scott Henderson	Abuse: Capt. Scott Henderson threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b)	

Case Summary

At approximately 5:27 AM on July 10, 2011, § 87(2)(b) called 911 to file a complaint and was connected to IAB. § 87(2)(b)'s complaint was received at the CCRB on July 14, 2011 and she provided the following phone statement on July 21, 2011.

At approximately 5:27 AM on July 10, 2011, § 87(2)(b) was going home with her friend § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s mother, § 87(2)(b). They were in a cab and got dropped off at the White Castle restaurant located at the intersection of Pennsylvania and Wortman Avenues in Brooklyn. An officer, identified in the IAB log as Capt. Scott Henderson of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North, arrived alone in a white unmarked car. § 87(2)(b) saw the title of captain noted on Capt. Henderson's nameplate, and gave his name when she made her initial complaint to IAB, but could not recall his name during her phone statement.

Capt. Henderson was dressed in uniform. From inside the car, Capt. Henderson told § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) to go home and said, "You can't be selling your bodies out here." § 87(2)(b) told Capt. Henderson that nobody was selling their body and said they were trying to get something to eat. She also pointed out to him that he had just seen them get out of a cab. Capt. Henderson then got out and approached the women. § 87(2)(b) spoke with the captain, and he pointed his finger in her face and said, "If you say anything I will put my hands on you and arrest you." § 87(2)(b) called 911 and as she was speaking to 911, Capt. Henderson again told § 87(2)(b) to go home and stop selling her body. Capt. Henderson then got back into his car and drove away.

An initial "please call" letter to § 87(2)(b) was sent on July 18, 2011. Her phone was busy on July 18, 2011, and a voice message was left on July 21, 2011. § 87(2)(b) called back that day and after providing her phone statement, § 87(2)(b) expressed that she was interested in obtaining financial compensation and hung up while the investigator explained the process of investigation. Voice messages were left for her on July 25, 2011 and July 29, 2011. A final "please call" letter was sent to § 87(2)(b) on August 3, 2011. She was reached by phone on that day and she said she did not want to pursue her complaint because the CCRB could not help her get money. After explaining the CCRB to § 87(2)(b) again, she scheduled an appointment for August 10, 2011. The first letter sent to § 87(2)(b) was returned on August 9, 2011. § 87(2)(b) did not appear for her appointment on August 10, 2011, but a "missed appointment" letter was not sent as the first letter was returned. Calls were made to § 87(2)(b) on August 15, 2011 and August 23, 2011, but her cell phone was no longer in service. The second letter to § 87(2)(b) was not returned by the USPS and a search of the DOC website on September 12, 2011 confirmed that she is not currently incarcerated.

A Lexis Nexis search on July 25, 2011 produced two addresses in Brooklyn for § 87(2)(b) and none for § 87(2)(b). Letters were sent to both addresses on July 25, 2011 but one of the addresses was wrong, as a different woman named § 87(2)(b) called the investigator and explained she was not involved in this incident. Phone calls were made to the three phone numbers produced by the Lexis Nexis search on July 25, 2011. One was disconnected and the other two were for the wrong numbers. During the phone call on August 3, 2011, § 87(2)(b) provided a phone number for § 87(2)(b) who was reached on August 4, 2011. § 87(2)(b) provided a phone statement that was consistent with § 87(2)(b)'s and she confirmed her and her mother's address as one of the addresses produced by the Lexis Nexis search. § 87(2)(b) also provided § 87(2)(b)'s phone number.

§ 87(2)(b) was reached by phone on August 11, 2011 and she confirmed her address as one produced by the Lexis Nexis search and asked to be called back later. A voice message was left for her during a second call that day. Four voice messages each were left for § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) on their respective cell phone numbers between the dates of August 15, 2011 and August 31, 2011. Letters were sent to § 87(2)(b) on August 23, 2011 and August 31, 2011, and a final letter was sent to § 87(2)(b) on August 23, 2011. None of the letters to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were returned by the USPS and a search of the DOC website on September 12, 2011 confirmed that neither woman is currently incarcerated.

Team: _____

:

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date

Supervisor:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date

Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date